arXiv:1511.08560v1 [quant-ph] 27 Nov 2015

Quantum no-go theorems in causality respecting systems in presence of closed timelike curves: Tweaking the Deutsch condition

Asutosh Kumar[1], Indranil Chakrabarty[2], Arun Kumar Pati[1], Aditi Sen(De)[1], Ujjwal Sen[1]
[1] *Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhunsi, Allahabad 211 019, India and*
[2] *Center for Security, Theory and Algorithmic Research, International Institute of Information Technology-Hyderabad, Gachibowli, Hyderabad, India.*

We consider causality respecting (CR) quantum systems interacting with closed timelike curves (CTCs), within the Deutsch model. We introduce the concepts of popping up and elimination of quantum information and use them to show that no-cloning and no-deleting, which are true in CR quantum systems, are no more valid in the same that are interacting with CTCs. We also find limits on the possibility of creation of entanglement between CR systems and CTCs. We prove that teleportation of quantum information, even in its approximate version, from a CR region to a CTC is disallowed. We subsequently show that tweaking the Deutsch model, by allowing the input and output to be not the same, leads to a nontrivial approximate teleportation beyond the classical limit.

1. INTRODUCTION

No-go theorems play an important role in quantum information science [1]. They are crucial both in nonclassical applications of quantum states and operations as resources, and towards a better understanding of quantum concepts. A good example is the no-cloning theorem [2], which states that nonorthogonal quantum states cannot be cloned perfectly, and can be seen as an underlying feature of the security of quantum cryptography [3]. Other examples include the no-broadcasting theorem [4, 5], the no-deleting theorem [6], the no-information splitting theorem [7], etc.

Recently, there have been some exciting developments in quantum information theory in the presence of closed timelike curves (CTCs). It is known that the general theory of relativity does allow the existence of a CTC, a world line which connects back on itself [8–17] (see [18] however). An important question is whether one can formulate a consistent theory of quantum mechanics in the presence of CTCs. Such a formalism was developed by Deutsch who proposed a model of quantum theory in the presence of CTCs [19] (cf. [20]).

Investigations have been made to see how the presence of closed timelike curves can affect the computational power and other abilities to perform information processing tasks of a system [21–23]. From the perspective of quantum computation, it has, e.g., been shown that access to a CTC would allow factorization of composite numbers efficiently with the help of a classical computer [21], a CTC-assisted quantum computer would be able to solve NP-complete problems [22], both classical and quantum computers under CTC belong to the same complexity class [23], etc. On the other hand, Brun *et al.* [24] have shown that if one has access to CTCs, then one can perfectly distinguish nonorthogonal quantum states, having possible implications for the security of quantum cryptography [3]. In the presence of CTCs, information flow of quantum states [25], purifications of mixed states [26], and nonlocal boxes [27] have also been addressed. Bennett *et al.* [28] have argued that the implications obtained by assuming the existence of CTCs need to be revisited when we assume that the input state in any protocol is a mixture of the possible inputs.

Before presenting the results, let us briefly describe here the Deutsch formalism [19]. It involves a unitary interaction, U, between a quantum system in a causality-respecting (CR) region with another system that has a world line in a region where closed timelike curves exist. It is assumed that the states of these systems are density matrices in standard quantum mechanics. The combined state of the CR and CTC systems before the interaction is a product state, $\rho_{\rm CR} \otimes \rho_{\rm CTC}$. The unitary transformation on the joint system changes the composite state as

$$\rho_{\rm CR} \otimes \rho_{\rm CTC} \to U(\rho_{\rm CR} \otimes \rho_{\rm CTC})U^\dagger. \tag{1}$$

For self-consistency, the Deutsch model requires

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\rm CR}(U\rho_{\rm CR} \otimes \rho_{\rm CTC}U^\dagger) = \rho_{\rm CTC}, \tag{2}$$

the "Deutsch self-consistency condition". Therefore the Deutsch formalism demands that the state of the CTC system at the output of the evolution is the same as that of the CTC system at the input of the evolution. Mathematically, the state of the CTC system is a fixed point solution of the self-consistency equation. In case there are multiple fixed points, one chooses their maximum-entropy mixture. On the other hand, the final state of the CR system, which does not have such restriction imposed on it, is given by

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\rm CTC}(U\rho_{\rm CR} \otimes \rho_{\rm CTC}U^\dagger) = \rho'_{\rm CR}. \tag{3}$$

The equations (1), (2), and (3) form the basic equations that provide the entire dynamics of the composite CTC and CR systems. It is important to note that $\rho_{\rm CTC}$

depends nonlinearly on $\rho_{\rm CR}$. Thus, it is evident that the output of the CR system is a nonlinear function of the input CR system density matrix [29].

In this work, we uncover two exotic features namely the "popping up" and "elimination" of quantum information in presence of CTCs. We show that the information present in the CR system "pops up" in the CTC qubit when it is allowed to interact with the CR system. We also show that it is possible to destroy or completely "eliminate" the information of the state of the CR system in presence of CTCs. Using these twin features, we prove the violations of two fundamental theorems of quantum mechanics, namely, the no-cloning [2, 30] and the no-deleting [6, 31] theorems. Note that cloning of an arbitrary quantum state of a CR system when in contact with a CTC is already known [19, 32–34]. We provide an independent proof of the same, which, we believe, gives a fresh perspective on the mechanism of the phenomenon of cloning. While cloning and deleting of quantum systems become possible in CR systems when interactions with CTCs are allowed, teleportation [35], a phenomenon that plays an important role in several aspects in the quantum mechanics of CR systems, becomes impossible. We first show the limits within which entanglement can be generated between a CR system and a CTC, and subsequently prove that teleportation is always disallowed. In contrast to, e.g., the no-cloning theorem in quantum theory of CR systems, the "no teleportation theorem" here does not allow even an approximate teleportation. We however show that "tweaking" the Deutsch criterion that allows deviations of the final states from their corresponding initial states, can result in nonclassical teleportation fidelities.

The concepts and the corresponding proofs about popping up and elimination are presented in Sec. 2. The possibility of cloning and deleting using CTCs are presented in Sec. 3. The results on entanglement and teleportation are presented in Sec. 4. The concept of "tweaking" the Deutsch criterion, and the possibility of nontrivial teleportation obtained thereby are presented in Sec. 5. We present a conclusion in Sec. 6.

2. POPPING UP AND ELIMINATION OF QUANTUM INFORMATION

There exists a notion of "permanence" of quantum information in the sense that information in a quantum world can neither be created nor destroyed [36]. In this section, we show that in the presence of a closed timelike curve, the information present in a CR system "pops up" in the CTC, and on the other hand, the information of a state present in a CR system can be completely destroyed ("eliminated"). These results suggest that quantum information in the presence of CTCs does not respect permanence of information.

Popping Up of Quantum Information:

Let $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR}\langle\psi|$ be an arbitrary state of the CR system and $\rho_{\rm CTC}$ is the state of the CTC. Let us suppose that they interact via the unitary, $U_{\rm SWAP}$, the swap operation, defined, for the bi-orthonormal product basis, $\{|i\rangle_{\rm CR}|j\rangle_{\rm CTC}\}_{i,j}$, as $U_{\rm SWAP}|i\rangle_{\rm CR}|j\rangle_{\rm CTC} = |j\rangle_{\rm CR}|i\rangle_{\rm CTC}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR}\langle\psi|\otimes\rho_{\rm CTC}\rightarrow\\&U_{\rm SWAP}(|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR}\langle\psi|\otimes\rho_{\rm CTC})U_{\rm SWAP}=\\&\rho_{\rm CR}\otimes|\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|.\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

Now, if we trace out the CR system, the final state of the CTC is $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|$. By the consistency condition of Deutsch, this should be same as the original state of the CTC, i.e., $\rho_{\rm CTC} = |\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|$. We therefore have that the joint CR-CTC system evolves as

$$|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR}\langle\psi|\otimes\rho_{\rm CTC}\rightarrow|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR}\langle\psi|\otimes|\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|,\tag{5}$$

implying that the information in the CR system is "popping up" in the CTC system. What is more, we can also say that to start with we had the CR and the CTC systems in the state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\otimes|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. Since this holds for an arbitrary input state of the CR system, the CTC has knowledge about all possible states in the CR system. Thus the mere possibility that a CTC *will be interacted* with a CR system can result in the popping up of the quantum information of the CR system in the CTC. Note that the popping up happens even before the interaction is implemented. Hence a CTC has knowledge about the past and future of all CR quantum systems in the universe, provided we assume that there exists a CTC that can be interacted with the relevant CR system with the swap operation.

While the discussions in the preceding paragraph were when the CR system is in a pure state, the same line of reasoning goes through if the CR system is in a mixed state, which in turn can be part of an entangled state [37].

Elimination of Quantum Information:

Just like creation of quantum information, CTCs can assist in the complete destruction of quantum information in a CR system. Again, we start with an arbitrary $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR}$ and a fixed ρ_{CTC}, which interact with the unitary, $U_{\rm SWAP}$, leading to the same relation as given in (4). By using the consistency condition of Deutsch, $\rho_{\rm CTC} = |\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|$, so that we have

$$|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR}\langle\psi|\otimes\rho_{\rm CTC}\rightarrow\rho_{\rm CR}\otimes\rho_{\rm CTC}.\tag{6}$$

Again in this case, just the possibility that a CTC *will be interacted* with a CR system can result in the "elimination" of the quantum information of the CR system, with the CTC remaining in its original state. And again the CR and the CTC systems can be thought of to be

in the state $\rho_{\rm CR} \otimes \rho_{\rm CTC}$ from the beginning. And like in popping up, the CR system can be mixed. Merely by choosing the CTC state to be one that has no information about the CR state, destroys the information in the CR state.

3. CLONING AND DELETING OF ARBITRARY QUANTUM STATE IN PRESENCE OF CTCS

Cloning and deleting of arbitrary quantum states are not possible in the quantum world [2, 6, 30, 31]. In this section, we use the phenomena of popping up and elimination of quantum information to prove that it is always possible to clone and delete quantum states in presence of CTCs. The possibility of cloning of quantum states in the presence of a CTC is known [19, 32–34], and Ref. [33], in particular, uses a sequence of unitaries including the swap operation to achieve the same. Here we present an independent proof that reveals an interesting way in which cloning can take place in a world with CTCs. It is to be noted here that the phenomena of popping up or elimination by themselves are not cloning or deleting (respectively), as we want the entire phenomena of cloning or deleting to occur only in CR systems.

Cloning of an Arbitrary State:

Theorem 3.1: `If` $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}$ `is an arbitrary quantum state in a CR region, then there exists a map` $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)} \rightarrow |\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}$ `from one CR region to another, in the presence of a CTC satisfying the Deutsch condition for the swap operator.`

Proof: Consider two CR systems, one in an arbitrary quantum state, $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}$, (the state to be cloned), and another in a fixed "blank" quantum state, $|B\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}$. Consider also a CTC in the state $\rho_{\rm CTC}$. The CTC system can be thought of as the "machine". We will apply two swap gates to prove the possibility of cloning in this model. Let us begin with the first, which is applied on the systems CR(1) and CTC, whence

$$\begin{aligned} &|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |B\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle B| \otimes \rho_{\rm CTC} \rightarrow \\ &U_{\rm SWAP}^{\rm CR(1):CTC}(|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |B\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle B| \otimes \\ &\rho_{\rm CTC})U_{SWAP}^{\rm CR(1):CTC} \\ &= \rho_{\rm CR(1)} \otimes |B\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle B| \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Applying the Deutsch condition, we have $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = \rho$, so that the state of the tripartite system becomes $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |B\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle B| \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|$. This is the phenomenon of popping up between the systems CR(1) and CTC. We now apply the second swap operation on the systems CR(2) and CTC, whereby

$$\begin{aligned} &|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |B\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle B| \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi| \rightarrow \\ &|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle\psi| \otimes |B\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle B|. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

For the Deutsch condition to be satisfied, we must have $|B\rangle\langle B| = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, resulting in both the CR systems (separately) being in the state $|\psi\rangle$. ■

Remark. Note that the self-consistency condition is applied twice. We may, for example, assume that an observer applies the first unitary between the subsystems CR(1) and CTC, while another observer applies the second.

Deleting of an Arbitrary State:

In the case of deleting, we are given two copies of an arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$, and we ask if there can be a physical (quantum) operation in a closed system which can take $|\psi\rangle|\psi\rangle|A\rangle \rightarrow |\psi\rangle|0\rangle|A'\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$, $|A\rangle$, and $|A'\rangle$ are fixed states independent of $|\psi\rangle$. The no-deleting theorem says that this operation is impossible in the quantum world, where the third subsystem consists of the entire universe outside the first two subsystems. We show now that if a CTC is made to interact with the first two (CR) subsystems, it is indeed possible to delete an arbitrary quantum state.

Theorem 3.2: `In a closed CR quantum system, deleting is possible provided it is allowed to interact with a CTC system satisfying the Deutsch condition for the swap operator.`

Remark. More specifically, we prove that if $|\psi\rangle$ and $|0\rangle$ are respectively arbitrary and fixed quantum states, then there exists a map $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(2)} \rightarrow |\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}|0\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}$ of two CR regions, in presence of a CTC satisfying the Deutsch condition for the swap operator. The action can be considered to be closed as the final state of the CTC system or any other system does not retain any information of the initial states of the CR systems.

Proof: We begin with two copies of $|\psi\rangle$ in CR regions, and CTC in the state $|0\rangle$. If we apply the swap gate between the CR(2) region and the CTC, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle\psi| \otimes |0\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle 0| \rightarrow \\ &U_{\rm SWAP}^{\rm CR(2):CTC}(|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle\psi| \\ &\otimes|0\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle 0|)U_{\rm SWAP}^{\rm CR(2):CTC} \\ &= |\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}\langle\psi| \otimes |0\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}\langle 0| \otimes |\psi\rangle_{\rm CTC}\langle\psi|. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Now the Deutsch consistency condition implies that the final state of the CTC must be exactly equal to the state of CTC before the interaction, i.e., $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| = |0\rangle\langle 0|$. Using this condition, we can write the final state of the tripartite system as $|\psi\rangle_{\rm CR(1)}|0\rangle_{\rm CR(2)}|0\rangle_{\rm CTC}$. Therefore, we have been able to take the CR(2) system to a

standard state, independent of its input state $|\psi\rangle$, while still keeping the state of the CR(1) system at its pre-interaction state. Furthermore, the CTC system is finally in the state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$, which is independent of $|\psi\rangle$, so that there is no information that is leaked out from the CR systems, CR(1) and CR(2), into the CTC. This is important as deleting must be considered in a system from where information is not leaking into the environment [6, 38, 39]. ■

Remark. We note here that in the case of cloning, we require to apply the swap operator twice, while for deleting, the same needs to be applied only once, showing that deleting information is easier compared to cloning, if we have a CTC system at hand.

4. IMPOSSIBILITY OF TELEPORTING A QUANTUM STATE FROM CR TO CTC

Creating Entanglement between CR and CTC:

Before considering the question of teleportation between CR and CTC worlds, let us briefly consider whether entanglement can be created between these two worlds, a question addressed before in Ref. [26]. Suppose that we wish to create the state $\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CTC}}$, which may be entangled, between a CR system, CR(1), and a CTC. For this purpose, we consider two CR systems and a CTC to be initially in the state $\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CR}(2)} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{CTC}}$, where the state $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{CR}(1)}\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CR}(2)}$ of CR(2) is the same as the state $\tilde{\rho}_{\mathrm{CTC}}$ of CTC. Applying the swap operator, $U_{\mathrm{SWAP}}^{\mathrm{CR}(2):\mathrm{CTC}}$, we will be able to have the state $\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CTC}}$, irrespective of whether the bipartite state ρ is entangled or separable. Note that the Deutsch condition is automatically satisfied for the evolution considered.

Let us now consider that a CTC is in a pure state and is interacting with a CR system by the swap operator. We then have the following no-go theorem.

Theorem 4.1: `(No Entanglement Theorem.) Two CR systems cannot get correlated, neither classically nor quantumly, if one of them is allowed to interact via the swap operator with a CTC which is in a pure state and which follows the Deutsch condition for the swap operator.`

Proof: Suppose that two CR systems are in the state $\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CR}(2)}$, and a CTC system in the pure state $|0\rangle_{\mathrm{CTC}}\langle 0|$ is allowed to interact with CR(2) by the swap operator. Post-interaction, we apply the Deutsch condition. This implies that the local state of CR(2) must be (both before and after the interaction) in the *pure* state $|0\rangle$, precluding any correlation with any other system. ■

Remark 1. While we refer to the above theorem as the "no entanglement theorem", it is in reality a "no correlation theorem", as neither classical nor quantum correlations are allowed in the situation described. We call it as the "no entanglement theorem", since we are using it in the context of the no teleportation theorem below.

Remark 2. We have discussed a method of creating entanglement between a CR system and a CTC above Theorem 4.1, by using entanglement between two CR systems. Theorem 4.1 states that the entanglement between the two CR systems can exist only if the premises of the theorem are not satisfied.

No Teleportation of Quantum States from CR to CTC:

Assuming that creation of an entangled state between a CR system and a CTC is possible, a next question is whether the same can be put to use. In particular, can we use the entangled state to teleport quantum information from the CR system to the CTC. The following result on teleportation is actually independent of whether the shared state is entangled or not.

Theorem 4.2: `(No Teleportation Theorem) It is not possible to teleport, even approximately, an arbitrary quantum state from a CR system to a CTC by a teleportation protocol that respects the Deutsch condition.`

Proof: Consider first the case of exact teleportation. Let a CR system, CR(1), and a CTC be in a fixed state $\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CTC}}$. Irrespective of whether the state is entangled or separable, let us assume that it is possible to exactly teleport the arbitrary state of a CR system, CR(2), to the CTC, by using the shared state. We apply the Deutsch condition after the teleportation has been performed, which implies that the state of CTC (both before and after the teleportation) is in the *fixed* state,

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{CR}(1)}\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CTC}}. \tag{10}$$

But the success of the teleportation protocol implies that this fixed state must be equal to the *arbitrary* state of CR(2). This is possible only if the initial state of CR(2) is the fixed state $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{CR}(1)}\rho_{\mathrm{CR}(1),\mathrm{CTC}}$. But in that case, there is nothing to teleport.

Moreover, since the output CTC state, for the teleportation protocol, must be in a fixed state (due to the Deutsch condition, as the initial state is a fixed state), we cannot even have an approximate teleportation in the scenario considered. ■

5. TWEAKING THE DEUTSCH CONDITION AND APPROXIMATE TELEPORTATION

The no teleportation theorem, derived in the preceding section, is similar to the no-go theorems of quantum mechanics in causality respecting systems. However, it has a distinct character of its own. In particular, both exact and approximate teleportations are not allowed from CR systems to CTC. This is in drastic contrast to, e.g., the quantum no cloning theorem in CR systems, which disallows exact cloning but allows approximate cloning [30]. In a quest for attaining approximate teleportation, here we address the question whether the same can be achieved by some change in the Deutsch condition (cf. [24]). The aim therefore is to attain approximate teleportation of an arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$ in a CR system to a CTC, whereby an approximate copy, $\rho^f_{\rm CTC}(\psi)$, is created in the CTC, which is as close as possible to the arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$. We demand that the fidelity of the approximate copy (averaged over the input state space), defined as

$$\mathcal{F} = \int \langle\psi|\rho^f_{\rm CTC}(\psi)|\psi\rangle d\psi, \tag{11}$$

to be higher than the classically achievable fidelity, i.e., the fidelity that is possible to achieve without the use of entangled shared states [40]. For the case of teleportation of a qubit, the classically achievable fidelity is $\frac{2}{3}$ in the quantum domain.

Let us now introduce a deviation, which is just sufficient for the intended purpose of attaining nonclassical teleportation, of the Deutsch self-consistency condition. To do that, we suppose that the initial and final states of the CTC, respectively denoted by $\rho^i_{\rm CTC}$ and $\rho^f_{\rm CTC}$, are such that

$$\|\rho^f_{\rm CTC} - \rho^i_{\rm CTC}\| \leq \epsilon, \tag{12}$$

for an ϵ in $[0, 1]$. The norm is chosen in such a way that both $\rho^f_{\rm CTC} - (1-\epsilon)\rho^i_{\rm CTC}$ and $(1+\epsilon)\rho^i_{\rm CTC} - \rho^f_{\rm CTC}$ are positive semidefinite. See [41, 42]. We refer to this as the *ϵ-close Deutsch model of CTC*, or, for short, ϵ-CTC.

For simplicity, let us suppose that the final state, $\rho^f_{\rm CTC}$, of the CTC, after the teleportation protocol has been carried out, is of the form

$$\rho^f_{\rm CTC} = (1-\epsilon)\rho^i_{\rm CTC} + \epsilon\rho, \tag{13}$$

where ρ is the arbitrary state to be teleported. For $\epsilon = 0$, the state is not teleported at all, and the original Deutsch self-consistency condition is exactly satisfied, while when $\epsilon = 1$, the state is perfectly teleported. Note that in all cases where ϵ is nonzero, the Deutsch self-consistency is violated. Now while $\rho^f_{\rm CTC} - (1-\epsilon)\rho^i_{\rm CTC} = \epsilon\rho \geq 0$, $(1+\epsilon)\rho^i_{\rm CTC} - \rho^f_{\rm CTC} = \epsilon(2\rho^i_{\rm CTC} - \rho)$ is non-negative when $2\rho^i_{\rm CTC} - \rho \geq 0$. Thus, $\|\rho^f_{\rm CTC} - \rho^i_{\rm CTC}\| \leq \epsilon$ holds when $2\rho^i_{\rm CTC} \geq \rho$. We refer to this relation as the "approximate teleportation condition".

A special case: When $\rho^i_{\rm CTC} = \frac{I_2}{2}$ (this is the case when the state shared in the CR–ϵ-CTC system is one of the Bell states), with I_2 being the identity operator on the qubit Hilbert space, and $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is an arbitrary single-qubit pure state, the above condition is trivially satisfied. For the state vector, $|\psi\rangle = \cos\frac{\theta}{2}|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2}|1\rangle$, on the Bloch sphere, the average fidelity is

$$\int \langle\psi|\rho^f_{\rm CTC}|\psi\rangle d\psi = \frac{1}{2}(1+\epsilon), \tag{14}$$

which exceeds the classical fidelity of two-thirds, when $\epsilon > \frac{1}{3}$.

We note here that when $\epsilon = 0$, the combined CR-CTC system is not quantum mechanical. It may however be expected that for nonzero ϵ, quantum mechanics will be regained. Our results show that quantum mechanics is at least beyond $\epsilon = \frac{1}{3}$.

6. CONCLUSION

In summary, we find that cloning and deleting of quantum information are possible in causality respecting quantum systems provided we allow it to interact with a closed timelike curve. These phenomena are impossible if we disallow the interaction. We show that the phenomena of cloning and deleting are possible in the presence of CTCs due to two other phenomena, viz., popping up and elimination of quantum information, that seem to be natural to CR systems in presence of CTCs. We moreover prove that teleportation of an arbitrary quantum state, even approximately, from a CR system to a CTC cannot occur, although teleportation between two CR systems is known to be possible. We also find limits to the creation of entangled states between a CR system and a CTC.

It is interesting to mention here of a result by Hardy [44], which shows that it is possible to build a toy model of the physical world in which teleportation is possible and no-cloning is valid, while the system has a local realistic description. It was later shown [45] that if one considers an arbitrary set of commuting quantum states, then any member of the set can be teleported through a separable shared quantum state. The shared quantum state, being separable, has a local hidden variable description, and an arbitrary set of commuting quantum states, since it may contain nonorthogonal quantum states, cannot be cloned (in causality respecting quantum systems), although can be (quantum mechanically) broadcast [4]. In this paper, we found that a CR system in the presence of a CTC has the opposite behavior: Teleportation is

disallowed, while cloning is possible.

We subsequently show that a modification in the Deutsch model of CTCs, which we call the ϵ-close Deutsch model, allows for nonclassical teleportation fidelities.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge discussions with Sasha Sami.

[1] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[2] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek, Nature **299**, 802 (1982); D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A **92**, 27 (1982); H. P. Yuen Phys. Lett. A 113, 405 (1986).
[3] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 145 (2002).
[4] H. Barnum, C. M. Caves, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 2818 (1996).
[5] G. M. D'Ariano, C. Macchiavello, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 060503 (2005).
[6] A. K. Pati and S. L. Braunstein, Nature **404**, 164 (2000).
[7] D. L. Zhou, B. Zeng, and L. You, Phys. Lett. A **352**, 41 (2006).
[8] W. J. van Stockum, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh A **57**, 135 (1937).
[9] K. Gödel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 447 (1949).
[10] S. Deser, R. Jackiw, and G. 'tHooft, Phys. Rev. Lett **68**, 267 (1992).
[11] A. Ori, Phys. Rev. Lett **95**, 021101 (2005).
[12] M. S. Morris, K. S. Thorne, and U. Yurtsever, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1446 (1988).
[13] V. P. Frolov and I. D. Novikov, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1057 (1990).
[14] S. W. Kim and K. S. Thorne, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 3929 (1991).
[15] J. R. Gott, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1126 (1991).
[16] S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 603 (1992).
[17] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 4470 (1992).
[18] M. S. Morris, K. S. Thorne, and U. Yurtsever, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1446 (1988); S. W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 603 (1992).
[19] D. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 3197 (1991).
[20] G. T. Horowitz and J. Maldacena, J. High Energy Phys. **02**, 008 (2004); U. Yurtsever and G. Hockney, Classical & Quantum Gravity **22**, 295 (2005); D. Gottesman and J. Preskill, J. High Energy Phys. **03**, 026 (2004); S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 061302 (2006); C. H. Bennett, in Proceedings of QUPON, Wien, 2005, http://www.research.ibm.com/people/b/bennetc/; G. Svetlichny, International Journal of Theoretical Physics, **50**, 3903 (2011); S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, R. Garcia-Patron, V. Giovannetti, Y. Shikano, S. Pirandola, L. A. Rozema, A. Darabi, Y. Soudagar, L. K. Shalm, and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 040403 (2011).
[21] T. A. Brun, Found. Phys. Lett. **16**, 245 (2003).
[22] D. Bacon, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 032309 (2004).
[23] S. Aaronson and J. Watrous, Proc. R. Soc. A **465**, 631 (2009).
[24] T. A. Brun, J. Harrington, and M. M. Wilde, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 210402 (2009).
[25] T. C. Ralph and C. R. Myers, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 062330 (2010).
[26] A. K. Pati, I. Chakrabarty, and P. Agrawal, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 062325 (2011).
[27] I. Chakrabarty, T. Pramanik, A. K. Pati, and P. Agrawal, Quantum Information and Computation **14**, 1251 (2014).
[28] C. H. Bennett, D. Leung, G. Smith, and J. A. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 170502 (2009).
[29] M. J. Cassidy, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 5676 (1995).
[30] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1844 (1966); N. Gisin and S. Massar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2153 (1997); S. Massar and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1259 (1995); V, Buzek, S. L. Braunstein, M. Hillery, and D. Bruss, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3446 (1997); L. M. Duan and G. C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 4999 (1998); S. Adhikari, A. K. Pati, I. Chakrabarty, and B. S. Choudhury, Quant. Inf. Proc. **6**, 4 (2007).
[31] A. K. Pati and S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Lett. A **315**, 208 (2003); S. Adhikari, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 052321 (2005).
[32] A. R. Plastino and C. Zander, *AIP Conf. Proc.: A century of relativity physics, ERE* **841**, 570 (2005).
[33] D. Ahn, C. R. Myers, T. C. Ralph, and R. B. Mann, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 022332 (2013).
[34] T. A. Brun, M. M. Wilde, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 190401 (2013).
[35] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crèpeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
[36] R. Jozsa, arXiv:quant-ph/0305114 (2003).
[37] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[38] M. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, arXiv:quant-ph/0109146 (2001).
[39] M. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, A. Sen(De), and U. Sen, Foundations of Physics **35**(12), 2041 (2005).
[40] P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1056 (1999).
[41] G. F. Simmons, *Introduction to Topology and Modern Analysis* (McGraw-Hill, Singapore, 1963).
[42] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2013).
[43] K. Zyczkowski and H-J. Sommers, J. Phys. A **34**, 7111 (2001).
[44] L. Hardy, arXiv:quant-ph/9906123 (1999).
[45] S. Ghosh, G. Kar, A. Roy, and U. Sen, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032309 (2002).